

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In re WESLEY F., a Person Coming Under  
the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

WESLEY F.,

Defendant and Appellant.

D055273

(Super. Ct. No. J220629)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Lawrence Kapiloff, Judge. (Retired Judge of the San Diego Sup. Ct. assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to art. VI, § 6 of the Cal. Const.) Affirmed.

The juvenile court declared 17-year-old Wesley F. a ward of the court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) after sustaining an allegation that he committed grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (a)). The court placed Wesley on probation on various conditions, including

completion of 60 hours of community service and abiding by an 8:00 p.m. curfew. At a subsequent restitution hearing, the court ordered Wesley to pay \$7,000 to the theft victim.

### FACTS

On June 30, 2008, Jill G. returned home from vacation and discovered that \$7,000 was missing from her bedroom. According to Jill, she had put \$7,000 (comprised of \$100 bills) in a white envelope, which she placed inside the second drawer down on the right side of a chest of drawers. The chest was in her bedroom closet. Two persons had been staying in Jill's residence as housesitters while she was on vacation; they denied taking the money. However, one of the housesitters had allowed Wesley to stay at the residence for three or four days. When police contacted Wesley, he admitted stealing \$600 from the residence; he said he gave \$100 to his best friend.

### DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. Counsel presents no argument for reversal, but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as a possible, but not arguable, issue: whether the juvenile court abused its discretion in imposing a restitution award of \$7,000.

We granted Wesley permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded.

A review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California, supra*, 386 U.S. 738, including the possible issue raised by

appellate counsel, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issue. Wesley has been adequately represented by counsel on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

---

BENKE, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

---

HUFFMAN, J.

---

McINTYRE, J.